



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,960	06/25/2003	Joe P. Crookham	P04049US2	3716

22885 7590 08/10/2007
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

DOAN, KIET M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/10/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/603,960	Applicant(s) CROOKHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner Kiet Doan	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,8,10,13-25,45,46 and 48-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,8,10,13-25,45,46 and 48-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is response to Remarks file on 06/04/27007.

Claims 1, 23, 45, 51 are amended.

Claims 3, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 26-44, 47 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 13-17, 19-25, 45, 46, 49-52, 54 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt et al. (US 5,898,384).

Consider **claims 1, 45**. Alt teaches an apparatus for controlling lighting system at a site to be lighted comprising:

an off-site central device including a database of events (C11, L20-24, Fig.2,

No.21/122 Illustrate as off-site central device including a database)

a remote device, the remote device connected to a wide-area lighting device

(C10, L1-8, Fig.1, Illustrate control unit 16 as read on the remote device connected to a wide-area lighting device);

a communication link to communicate data from the central device to the remote device related to a function of the lighting system and an event or condition (C11, L20-65, Fig.2, Illustrate transceiver between no.20 and No.22 wherein the computer control system 21 as operated function of the lighting).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made that person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Alt system, such that off site computer/central device connected with remote device to control the lighting system to provide means for the convenient of controlling the lighting in large area/long distance without dispatch technician and save cost.

Consider **claims 2, 16, 46, 54**. Alt teaches the limitation of claims **but silent on** the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the database comprises a schedule of events (C10, L5-30 control unit received programming as read on schedule of events).

Consider **claim 4**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the network device is computers or network of computers (Fig.2, Illustrate No.21 and described).

Consider **claim 5**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the remote device comprises a digital controller (C13, L46-65).

Consider **claims 10, 25, 49**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the communications link comprises a wide area network (C3, L13-20).

Consider **claims 13, 17, 18, 20, 50**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the remote device includes a cellular receiver (C12, L38-47, Fig.2, No.20 and No.22 Illustrate).

Consider **claim 14**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said data comprises instructions (C10, L5-8 teach programming as read on instructions).

Consider **claim 15**. Alt teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said instructions include one or more of the set comprising turn on, turn off (C10, L5-20).

Consider **claims 21-24**. Alt teach the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a component to revise said database (C10, L5-8, C11, L10-25).

Consider **claims 51**. Alt teaches the system of claim 45 wherein said data relates to instructions regarding the operation of an electrical load (C6, L30-41).

Consider **claim 52**. Alt teaches the system of claim 45 wherein the customer device is related to one or more of the set comprising cellular phone, internet connected computer, fax machine, and telephone (C12, l38-47, Fig.2, No. 22).

3. Claims 8, 19, 48, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt et al. (US 5,898,384) in view of Levy (US 6,204,615 B1).

Consider **claims 8, 19, 48, 53**. Alt teaches the limitations of claims as discuss above **but silent on** the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the wide-area lighting device comprises sports lighting or security lighting.

In an analogous art, Levy teaches "Intelligent outdoor lighting control system". Further, **Levy teaches** the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the wide-area lighting device comprises sports lighting or security lighting (Abstract, C1, L27-33, C2, L41-51, Fig.1 Illustrate lighting system with poles 10 wherein can be located in security area such as parking lots, airports).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made that person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Alt and Levy system, such that wherein the wide-area lighting device comprises sports lighting or security lighting to provide means for safety and security.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiet Doan whose telephone number is 571-272-7863.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kiet Doan
Patent Examiner


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISOR